View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Epsilon Open Archive

# A trade performance analysis of fresh fruit and vegetables in Mediterranean countries.

*Fredrik O. L. Nilsson*
*Emma Lindberg*
*Yves Surry*

*Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU)*
*Department of Economics / Institutionen för ekonomi*

*Working Paper Series 2007:1*
*Uppsala 2007*

*ISSN 1401-4068*
*ISRN SLU-EKON-WPS – 07/1--SE*

# A trade performance analysis of fresh fruit and vegetables in Mediterranean countries.

*Fredrik O. L. Nilsson*
*Emma Lindberg*
*Yves Surry*

Uppsala 2007

© Fredrik O.L. Nilsson, Emma Lindberg, Yves Surry
Fredrik.Nilsson@ekon.slu.se

Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Institutionen för ekonomi
Box 7013
750 07 UPPSALA

ISSN 1401-4068
ISRN SLU-EKON-WPS—07/1--SE

Tryck: SLU, Institutionen för ekonomi, Uppsala 2007.

**Abstract**

For many of the countries surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, fruit and vegetables are very important products. In light of the increasing trade liberalization and thus increasing competition between countries, this paper aims to investigate the competitiveness of ten Mediterranean countries with respect to fresh fruit and vegetables. The analysis rests on two foundations. Firstly, a set of indicators are calculated to give a general impression of trends and potentials. Secondly, two constant market share analyses are performed. In the first analysis, the countries' competitiveness in world trade is investigated and used as a reference scenario. In the second analysis, the investigated countries' competitiveness has been investigated with respect to trade with one major trading partner; the European Union. The results generally show that the competitiveness of the investigated countries has deteriorated over the period.

Keywords: Constant market share, revealed comparative advantage, trade performance.

**Acknowledgements:**

The work reported in this paper was supported by the MEDFROL project: "Market and Trade Policies for Mediterranean Agriculture: The case of fruit/vegetable and olive oil", funded by the European Commission under contract reference SSPE-CT-2004-502459. The authors would like acknowledge Charlotte Emlinger and Florence Jacquet for providing the trade statistics.

# Table of contents:

# 1 Introduction

Trade performance is a highly topical area today due to the trade facilitation resulting from the ongoing liberalization process in the world. For the countries surrounding the Mediterranean Sea, trade has often been an important wealth-creating vehicle over the centuries. The Barcelona Agreement was signed in 1995 between the European Union (EU) and 12 Mediterranean countries (MEDs). One objective of the Barcelona Declaration is to establish a free trade area in the Euro-Mediterranean region by 2010. The agreement sets forth a structure where bilateral agreements, called Euro-Mediterranean agreements (EMAs), are to be signed between the EU and the MEDs (Kuiper & dell'Aquila 2004), eventually encompassing all economic sectors (Gallina 2005).[1] The liberalization process is especially important for the agricultural sector for two reasons. Firstly, large parts of the Mediterranean economies are dependent on agriculture and free trade with a major trading partner such as the EU could thus be a substantial stimulus to the region. Although trade in horticultural products has increased substantially over the last decades, trade could increase further if the protective measures of major trading partners were reduced (Huang 2004). Secondly, it is reasonable to assume that the non-EU Mediterranean countries may have comparative advantages over their European Union competitors (Vlachos 2001, Muaz 2004). Thus, the prospect of deepening trade within the region may be disadvantageous for certain sectors in the southern EU member countries. This may in particular be the case for the fruit and vegetable sectors and the potential deepening of the EMAs to improve trade in agricultural products has invoked fears in European horticultural regions (García Alvares-Coque 2002).

[1] So far, bilateral EMAs have been signed between the EU and Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Palestinian Territories, Lebanon and Syria. Concerning the two latter countries, the agreements have

This paper aims to shed further light on the competitiveness of the non-processed fruit and vegetable sectors of some Mediterranean countries. More specifically, the sectors that are investigated belong to the harmonized system (HS) categories HS07 (vegetables) and HS08 (fruit). In order to gain a thorough understanding of the structure and development of the sectors in the countries, this paper has two foundations. Firstly, the importance of the sectors for the economies and their exports is assessed through presentation of a set of indicators such as Relative Unit Values (RUV) and Revealed Comparative Advantage (RCA). Additional information, including sector shares in national exports and per capita exports, is presented in order to give a broader picture of the importance of the sectors to the economies. Secondly, the trade performance of the fruit and vegetable sectors in the countries is analyzed through a constant market share (CMS) analysis. In this analysis, the development of exports is decomposed into four components: a market size effect, a commodity composition effect, a market distribution effect and a competitiveness effect. Through this process, it is possible to elaborate further on the issue if the countries are utilizing their potentials.

Ten Mediterranean countries have been selected for the analysis in paper: Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Cyprus, Greece and Spain. This choice is based on the countries' geographical proximity to the Mediterranean basin and on their economic structures. Algeria and Libya, for example, have been omitted since they mainly export oils whereas Syria and the Palestinian Territories are not included in the analysis due to lack of available data. Greece and Spain serve to indicate the change of EU member countries' competitiveness in light of the increasing competition following EU trade liberalization.

---

been negotiated or signed but are not yet implemented. Between Turkey and the EU, a customs union exists since 1995.

# 2 Methodology

**Revealed Comparative Advantage and Relative Unit Values**

The RCA measure provides useful information about trade prospects and helps as one indication of a country's specialization with respect to specific commodities. Different measures of Revealed Comparative Advantage[2] exist but in this paper, the version developed by CEPII (1998) and used by ITC (2000) is utilized. It is defined as follows:

$$RCA_{icl}^{t} = \frac{1000}{X_{i..}^{t} + M_{i..}^{t}} \cdot \left[ \left( X_{icl}^{t} - M_{icl}^{t} \right) - \left( X_{i..}^{t} - M_{i..}^{t} \right) \cdot \frac{\left( X_{icl}^{t} + M_{icl}^{t} \right)}{\left( X_{i..}^{t} + M_{i..}^{t} \right)} \right] \qquad (1)$$

With

$cl$ being the set of commodities for which the RCA is calculated.

$X_{i..}^{t}$ and $M_{i..}^{t}$ being total exports and imports, respectively, for country $i$ in year $t$.

$X_{icl}^{t}$ and $M_{icl}^{t}$ being total exports and imports, respectively, of country $i$ for products belonging to the cluster $cl$ in year $t$.

$\left( X_{icl}^{t} - M_{icl}^{t} \right)$ the observed trade imbalance of country $i$ for the cluster $cl$ in year $t$.

$\frac{\left( X_{icl}^{t} + M_{icl}^{t} \right)}{\left( X_{i..}^{t} + M_{i..}^{t} \right)}$ the weight of cluster $cl$ in country $i$ exports in year $t$.

$\left( X_{i..}^{t} - M_{i..}^{t} \right) \cdot \frac{\left( X_{icl}^{t} + M_{icl}^{t} \right)}{\left( X_{i..}^{t} + M_{i..}^{t} \right)}$ the theoretical imbalance of country $i$ for the cluster $cl$ in year $t$.

A value of less than zero implies that the country has a revealed comparative disadvantage in the product. Similarly, if the index exceeds zero, the country is said to have a revealed comparative advantage in the product. The RCA is not primarily to be used for comparisons between countries but serves instead as an indicator of the level of specialization of a given sector within a given country.

The Relative Unit Value indicator measures the average unit value of a country's exports in relation to the world average unit value. As the world average RUV equals unity, a RUV of less than unity implies that the country exports its products at a lower price than the world

average unit price. Consequently, a country with a RUV higher than unity is exporting at a price higher than the world average price. A higher price than the world average implies one of two things. Either the products are homogeneous in which case a less competitive country will export at higher prices. Alternatively, according to new trade theories with heterogeneous products, a higher price reflects superior quality and thus cannot be viewed as an indicator of poor price competitiveness (ITC 2000).

**Constant Market Share and Previous Studies**

The CMS analysis is a traditional tool that often has been used to deal with structural effects.[3] It is a relatively simple method to investigate growth rates and the traditional CMS model was first used to analyze international trade by Tyszynski (1951). The constant market share analysis has since been applied, in various versions, on many regions and periods. Some studies, e.g. Ballingall & Briggs (2001), Briggs *et al.* (2001) and Chaptea *et al.* (2005), use CMS analysis to analyze countries' total competitiveness at an aggregated level. It is more common though to analyze certain sectors. Brownie & Dalziel (1993) perform the analysis at both aggregated and sector levels when they investigate New Zealand's export performance between 1970 and 1984. In a study that focuses on Belgium-Luxembourg, but that also incorporates the EU countries and other regions, Michel (2005) disaggregates the total effects with respect to contribution of commodities and regions. Juswanto & Mulyanti (2003) use CMS analysis to explain some export problems for the Indonesian manufacturing sector. Likewise, Drysdale & Lu (1996) assess Australia's export performance to East Asia for the period 1984-1994, dividing exports into manufactures, minerals/fuels and agricultural commodities. Ahmandi-Esfahani (2006) also analyses

[2] RCA was first introduced by Balassa (1965).
[3] The CMS method, also called shift-share analysis, is used in regional economics and geography to study the structural effects of regional variables such as employment and productivity. For more details on applications of shift-share analysis at the regional level, see Knudsen (2000).

Australia's export performance but with respect to the processed food sector's exports to South East Asia over the period 1980-2003. Hayward & Erickson (1995) investigates the potentials of NAFTA with respect to US producers, disaggregating trade at sector level as well as source by US state. Complementing the former study is Gazel & Schwer (1998), who also investigate the competitiveness of US states, and Markusen *et al.* (1991) who investigate US competitiveness at a regional level.

In a study from 1971, Rigaux (1971) uses CMS analysis to investigate Canadian exports of wheat. Another CMS study focusing on wheat is Veeman *et al.* (1991), who investigates the export performance of major exporters, including the European Union, while Ahmadi-Esfahani (1993) analyses Egyptian wheat imports. In a CMS like analysis, García Alvarez-Coque & Bautista (1994) investigate the export performance of less developed countries for horticultural products to the European Union. They find that the main contribution to the LDC export growth to the EU in the periods 1975-1979 and 1985-1989 is due to the global import growth effect. The effect was however counteracted by a declining share of non-EU suppliers in EU consumption. Chebbi & Gil (2002) use the CMS method to analyze the competitive position of Tunisian dates exports to the European Union. EU demand has been stable and Tunisia is the main supplier to the EU, although French exports and re-exports are gaining in importance. Highly relevant for the study at hand is Martínez Gómez & Álvarez-Coque (2005) who investigate trade flows between the EU and some Mediterranean partners for the period 1995-1996 to 2000-2001. Our study is complementary to theirs insofar as they study specific commodities, e.g. tomatoes, and trade with the EU. Thus, the study at hand has a broader scope as it also includes fruit and vegetables at an aggregated level and relates trade performance to world trade. Their results will be further referred to in the concluding section of this paper.

As mentioned above, the CMS analysis has been performed in various versions with some differences. The method has however often been criticized on the ground that it lacks a solid theoretical foundation (e.g. Houston 1967, Richardson 1971a,b), although Merkies and van der Meer (1988) display a such a foundation by relating the CMS analysis to a two-stage homothetic Armington (1969) demand model. The method chosen in this paper to decompose the development of trade into four different components is based on Leamer & Stern (1970). That is also the version of the CMS that Merkies & van der Meer (1988) utilize when they support the theoretical foundation and thus it seems as a good choice to use in an applied study.

At the basis of the CMS analysis is always the assumption that a country's share of exports in world imports should be constant. If the share in world imports changes, there is a difference between the constant market share norm and the actual export performance. The actual export performance could then be disentangled into four components: a market size effect, a commodity composition effect, a market distribution effect and a competitiveness effect. In order to describe the trade decomposition, we need the following definitions:

$V_{i.}$ = value of A's exports of commodity *i* in period 1.

$V'_{i.}$ = value of A's exports of commodity *i* in period 2.

$V_{.j}$ = value of A's exports to country *j* in period 1.

$V'_{.j}$ = value of A's exports to country *j* in period 2.

$V_{ij}$ = value of A's exports of commodity *i* to country *j* in period 1.

$V'_{ij}$ = value of A's exports of commodity *i* to country *j* in period 2.

$r$ = percentage increase in total world exports from period 1 to period 2.

$r_i$ = percentage increase in world exports of commodity $i$ from period 1 to period 2.

$r_{ij}$ = percentage increase in world exports of commodity $i$ to country $j$ from per. 1 to per. 2.

$\Delta X_c$ = absolute change in exports of country A between period 1 and period 2.

These definitions imply that for period 1 we have:

$$\sum_j V_{ij} = V_{i.} \qquad \sum_i V_{ij} = V_{.j} \tag{2}$$

and likewise for period 2. Additionally, country A's exports in period 1 is given by:

$$\sum_i \sum_j V_{ij} = \sum_i V_{i.} = \sum_j V_{.j} = V_{..} \tag{3}$$

Assuming that exports are completely undifferentiated with respect to commodity and region of destination would, when applying the constant share norm, give us the following identity:

$$V'_{..} - V_{..} \equiv \Delta X_c \equiv r \cdot V_{..} + \left(V'_{..} - V_{..} - rV_{..}\right) \tag{4}$$

That is, if country A maintained its market share, then exports would increase by $r \cdot V_{..}$ and the growth in exports could be divided into one part associated with general increase in world exports and an unexplained residual, which is called the competitiveness effect. A positive competitiveness could be attributed to a decrease in a country's relative export price while a negative competitiveness likewise could be attributed to an increase in the country's relative export price.

With these definitions and identities in mind, we can now proceed to the complete decomposition identity. In this identity, we now consider exports to differ not only with respect to commodities, but also with respect to destination. The argument for the latter division is to take into account that some countries might have easy access to fast growing

countries through historical patterns, geographic proximity or trade agreements while other countries do not. The identity equivalent to (4) then becomes:

$$V'_{ij} - V_{ij} \equiv r_{ij} \cdot V_{ij} + \left(V'_{ij} - V_{ij} - r_{ij} \cdot V_{ij}\right) \tag{5}$$

which, at an aggregated level, is equal to:

$$\Delta X_c \equiv \sum_i \sum_j \left(V'_{ij} - V_{ij}\right) \equiv \sum_i \sum_j r_{ij} \cdot V_{ij} + \sum_i \sum_j \left(V'_{ij} - V_{ij} - r_{ij} \cdot V_{ij}\right) \equiv$$

$$\underbrace{r \cdot V_{..}}_{1} + \underbrace{\sum_i \left(r_i - r\right) \cdot V_{i.}}_{2} + \underbrace{\sum_i \sum_j \left(r_{ij} - r_i\right) \cdot V_{ij}}_{3} + \underbrace{\sum_i \sum_j \left(V'_{ij} - V_{ij} - r_{ij} \cdot V_{ij}\right)}_{4} \tag{6}$$

As shown in identity (6), the total change in a country's exports, $\Delta X_c$, is decomposed into four components:

> 1: **Market Size effect**, *MS*: The change in exports attributable to the general change in world exports. It is the hypothetical growth that would have occurred if the country had increased its exports at the same pace as world imports have increased.
>
> 2. **Commodity Composition effect**, *CC*: Measures whether the country in period 1 focused on commodities that grew relatively fast, or slowly, between period 1 and period 2. The value is positive if the country has concentrated its exports on commodities with growth rates that are higher than the world average. Similarly, the value is negative if the country has focused on slowly growing commodity markets.
>
> 3. **Market Distribution effect**, *MD*: Measures whether the country in period 1 focused on destination markets that experienced relatively rapid, or slow, growth between period 1 and period 2. The value is positive if the country has concentrated its exports to markets that are growing relatively fast and negative if they are growing relatively slowly.
>
> 4. **Competitiveness Effect**, *CE*: The residual reflects the difference between the actual export growth and the export that would have occurred had the country maintained its share in all markets for all commodities. A negative value implies that the country has failed to maintain market shares in all markets for all commodities, i.e. its competitiveness has decreased. A positive value means it has increased its market shares in all markets for all commodities, i.e. competitiveness has increased.

The first three effects indicate the growth that the country should have had if it had maintained its share in all markets for all commodities. The fourth effect, the

competitiveness effect, may be calculated as a residual. If the value is negative, then the country grows slower than it should have given the constant market share norm. If the value is positive, the country grows faster than it would have given the constant market share norm. This implies that although the market size effect might imply that the country grows faster than the world and that it is increasing its market shares, it might still grow slower than it should have had it maintained its market shares in all markets for all commodities. Thus, a country might display a negative competitiveness despite having increased its world market shares.

Beside the absolute values that are calculated above, relative values could facilitate interpretation as well as comparison between countries. When the relative values are calculated, the absolute effects are divided by the actual changes in exports the countries have experienced.[4] Relative values like these clarify to what extent the different effects contribute to the total change in exports. However, the relative values create some complications, as will be clarified below, when the actual export change is negative. In those situations, in order to get the correct sign on the relative value and interpret the relative value correctly, absolute values of the changes may have to be used in the calculations. Taking the relative market size effect (*"MS%"*) as an example, the absolute value is always positive if world exports have increased over the period. If $\Delta X_c$ is > 0, then *"MS%"* > 100 implies that the change in country exports is smaller than the increase would have been had it followed the increase of world exports. Likewise, if $\Delta X_c$ is > 0, then *"MS%"* < 100 implies that the change in country exports is larger than the increase would have been had it followed the increase of world exports. Essentially, the smaller the value of

[4] For example, $MS\% = \left(MS / \Delta Xc\right)$. This follows the method of Leamer & Stern (1970) and has also been used by e.g. Veeman *et al.* (1991), Juswanto & Mulyanti (2003) and Drysdale & Lu (1996). It would have

*"MS%"*, the more the country increases its exports relative to the world. If, on the other hand, $\Delta X_c$ is < 0, then the absolute value of $\Delta X_c$ is used in order to get the correct sign on the relative effect. As the change in exports is negative, it is obvious that the country is loosing share in world markets but further information cannot be revealed. The interpretations of the relative effects could be summarized as in Table 1.

**Table 1: General interpretation of relative effects associated with the CMS analysis.**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Relative market size effect | | |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"MS%"* > 100 | The lower *"MS%"*, the less its relative share in world markets declines. |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"MS%"* < 100 | The lower *"MS%"*, the more its relative share in world markets increases. |
| $\Delta X_c < 0$ | | Loses share in world markets. |
| Relative commodity composition effect | | |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"CC%"* > 0 | The higher *"CC%"*, the more it is focused on fast growing commodities. |
| $\Delta X_c < 0$ | *"CC%"* > 0 | Indeterminate. |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"CC%"* < 0 | The lower *"CC%"*, the less focused it is on fast growing commodities. |
| $\Delta X_c < 0$ | *"CC%"* < 0 | The lower *"CC%"*, the less focused it is on fast growing commodities. |
| Relative market distribution effect | | |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"MD%"* > 0 | The higher *"MD%"*, the more focused on fast growing partners |
| $\Delta X_c < 0$ | *"MD%"* > 0 | Indeterminate |
| $\Delta X_c > 0$ | *"MD%"* < 0 | The lower *"MD%"*, the less focused on fast growing partners. |
| $\Delta X_c < 0$ | *"MD%"* < 0 | The lower *"MD%"*, the less focused on fast growing partners. |
| Relative competitiveness effect | | |
| The higher the value, above zero, the more the country has increased its competitiveness.<br>The higher the value, below zero, the less the country has decreased its competitiveness. | | |

The differences between three periods have been investigated with the base period being the average of 1992-1993 for most countries.[5] The base period is 1993-1994 for Morocco and 1994-1995 for Egypt and Jordan. The second period is 1997-1998, which is also the initial

been possible to use some other reference; *e.g.* the changes in world trade that take place over the period (ITC 2000) or the initial world export market share (Michel 2005).

period for Lebanon and Israel. 2002-2003 is the last period. The periods are henceforth referred to as P1, P2 and P3, respectively. These periods are suitable for several reasons. Four countries became members of the WTO in 1995[6], five of GAFTA[7] in 1998[8] and EMAs came into effect for four countries[9] between P2 and P3. Thus, some important trade facilitating effects took place between periods and may be possible to capture in the analysis. The changes between P1 and P2 (Phase 1, '*P-1'*), P2 and P3 (Phase 2, '*P-2'*) and P1 and P3 (Phase Total, '*P-T'*) are displayed in the tables.

**Data availability**

The trade data that has been used in the calculations is from the COMTRADE database of the UN Statistics Division. As mentioned in the introduction, the data that has been used is for the sub-categories of HS07 and HS08 at the 4-digit level. That is, HS0701-HS0714 have been used for vegetables and HS0801-HS0814 have been used for fruit.[10] Two sets of analyses have been performed. In the first analysis, the natural choice has been to check the countries' competitiveness in world trade and used it as reference scenario. In a second stage, the investigated countries' competitiveness has been investigated with respect to trade with one major trading partner: the European Union, specified as EU15. It should be remembered however, that not all countries/commodities have a significant share of exports to that region. As can be seen in Table A3, Jordan is the most notable exception with a substantial share of exports not being directed towards member states of the EU. They are rather mostly directed to other Middle Eastern nations such as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.

[5] Averages are used in order to smoothen random yearly effects and get more reliable results. Different periods are used for different countries due to lack of trade data.
[6] Tunisia, Israel, Morocco and Egypt.
[7] Greater Arab Free Trade Agreement.
[8] Tunisia, Morocco, Jordan, Egypt and Lebanon.
[9] Tunisia (1998), Israel (2000), Morocco (2000) and Jordan (2002).

The results of the CMS analysis with the world as base are presented in Table A7, CMS I, whereas Table A8, CMS II, presents it with the European Union as base in the calculations. The results for '*P-1'*, '*P-2'* and '*P-T'* are presented. The absolute change in exports is presented as ΔX. The decomposition is then presented as MS (market size effect), CC (commodity composition effect), MD (market distribution) and CE (competitiveness effect). Below the absolute values, relative values are calculated by dividing the value of the absolute effect by the change in exports. The relative effects are denominated by the abbreviation for the absolute effect followed by the symbol %.

# 3 Results

**Export values and main outlets**

Table A2 presents the most important vegetables and fruit with respect to export value. For use of comparison, one section of the table contains 'all agricultural commodities'. Some general patterns emerge: In the category 'vegetables', tomatoes and potatoes are very important commodities for most of the countries. Greece is the only country where neither of those products is included in the top three exports. In the category 'fruit', citrus fruit is the most important commodity for five of the countries and the second most important for Israel. Dates is the most important commodity for Tunisia and Israel (although with an export value only slightly higher than citrus fruit) whereas nuts is the most important for Turkey. Turkey has a relatively diversified export structure with citrus fruit and grapes being important as well. For some countries, Tunisia, Turkey, Greece and Spain, fruit exports dominate vegetable exports while the opposite being true for Egypt and Jordan.

[10] See Table A9 for descriptions of the various 4 digit HS categories.

Turning to the main outlets of the investigated countries' exports for the years 1997 and 2003, the right hand side of Table A3 presents the top destinations for vegetables. Some historical and/or geographic patterns emerge. The most important market for Moroccan and Tunisian exports in both periods is France. Countries in the Middle East are important markets for Jordan. For Egypt, Saudi Arabia was an important market in 1997, receiving 18% of exports. However, in 2003, the share had fallen to 12% and Italy had become the most important destination with a share of 15%. The United Kingdom is a very important market for Cyprus and Israel. Israel is also the only country that has a large share of its exports going to the USA.[11] In 2003, Germany has become the most important destination market for Cyprus though. Exports from Spain and Greece are mainly shipped to Germany and other EU members in both periods. Germany is also a very important destination for Turkish exports, although Iraq has become the most important partner in 2003. In general, the shares of destination markets in exports are relatively stable between the two periods.

The left hand side of Table A3 presents the main destinations for fruit exports. In this case too, some historical and/or geographic patterns can be noticed. The most important market for Israel and Cyprus is the United Kingdom, followed by other EU countries. Similarly, exports from Turkey, Spain and Greece are mainly shipped to Germany and other EU members. The most important market for Moroccan and Tunisian exports in both periods is France. Countries in the Middle East are important markets for Jordan: in 1997, Saudi Arabia was the top destination and imported 38% of Jordanian exports. The share had fallen to less than nine percent six years later as Jordan managed to diversify to other markets and decrease its dependence on Saudi Arabia. The creation of the free trade agreement GAFTA

[11] There has been a free trade agreement between the USA and Israel since 1985. In 1995, an agreement on trade in agricultural products was signed between the two countries. The agreement is, after revisions, valid until 2008 (Markou & Stavri, 2005).

is likely to have facilitated the process. Likewise, in 1997 Saudi Arabia was a very important market for Egypt, receiving 24% of exports. In 2003, Russia had increased its share to 33% while Saudi Arabia had plummeted to 8%. In general, it can be noticed that the shares of destination markets in exports are relatively stable between the two periods. The major exception is Saudi Arabia as destination market for Jordanian and Egyptian exports.

**Other indicators**

Regarding vegetables, most of the investigated countries display a positive trend in exports over the period 1995-2003 (Table A4). Jordan and Spain exhibit especially strong annual average growth rates of 10.2% and 6.6% respectively. Morocco, Tunisia and Israel exhibit growth rates close to 3%, with Greece following below at nearly 2%. Performing poorly are Egypt and Turkey with growth close to zero. Cyprus performs the worst with exports declining at an average rate of 2.5% annually. Somewhat surprisingly, Cyprus is the country with the second highest share in national exports, 4.2%. The only other country with an equally high share is Jordan with 4.4%. Three other countries have shares in national exports higher than 2% but lower than 3%, namely Morocco, Syria and Spain. Egypt is close though with a share of 1.8%. For Tunisia, the share in national exports is negligible.

Interestingly, only two-thirds of the countries have positive vegetable net exports (Morocco, Israel, Jordan, Turkey, Cyprus and Spain). These countries are also the ones with the highest per capita exports (with Greece as an exception which has negative net exports but a per capita export of 10$/c). There is a large spread of per capita exports among those countries, ranging from 95$/c in Spain to Turkey that exports less than 10$/c. One of the countries, Spain, has an exceptionally high share in world markets, 14%. Only one other country, Turkey with 1.7%, has a world market share higher than 1%, although Morocco and Egypt

come close with shares just below 1%. This implies that except for Spain, and possibly Turkey, all Mediterranean countries have small shares in world exports.

Most of the countries display RCA values above unity for vegetables at an aggregated level (Table A5). The only country with a negative value is Tunisia with -0.9. Jordan stands out with a RCA value of 17.5, followed by Morocco, Cyprus and Spain that all have values between 10 and 13. The lowest of the remaining countries is Greece with a value of 1.4. Clearly, a majority of the countries display substantial revealed comparative advantages within the vegetable sector. When potatoes, tomatoes and cucumbers are investigated, the values are much lower and even negative in some cases. Only a few countries and commodities remain with high values: Moroccan tomatoes, Jordanian tomatoes and Cypriote potatoes with RCA values of 6.4, 8.1 and 8.7, respectively.

Table A6 displays the relative unit values and their annual average rate of change between 1993 and 2003. For vegetables at an aggregated level, four of the countries display values substantially higher than unity while the remainder range from 0.42 for Egypt to 0.96 for Cyprus. All countries but Tunisia, Egypt and Turkey display a positive trend in RUV over the period. At the disaggregated level, the results are more diverse. Greece, for example, which has the highest aggregated value, has a negative trend and values at or below unity for potatoes and tomatoes while having a strongly positive trend for cucumbers.

Regarding fruit (Table A4), just over half of the countries have a positive trend of exports for the period 1995-2003. Two of the countries, Egypt and Spain, diverge from the others with average annual growth rates of 9.7% and 4.4% respectively. Tunisia, Turkey and Morocco have growth rates ranging from 0.8% to 1.6%. The remainder displayed a decline

in exports with Israel and Jordan performing especially poorly with average annual declines of -3.6% and -5.5% respectively.

Despite the strong trend of exports for Egypt, fruit has a surprisingly low share in national exports, 0.7%, approximately the same level as Israel and Jordan. Fruit is slightly more important in Tunisia with a share of 1.2%. The remaining countries range from 3% to 4.4%. Although Cyprus has had a declining trend, it is apparent that fruit is still an important commodity for the country with respect to exports. It has the largest share in exports of the investigated countries: 4.4%.

Only one of the countries has a negative value of net exports, Jordan. The largest net exporter by far is Spain, followed by Turkey. The range of per capita exports range from almost zero in Egypt to 123 $/c for Spain. This latter country is followed by Cyprus, 51$/c, Greece, 41$/c, Israel, 30$/c, and Turkey, 20$/c. The two remaining countries, Morocco and Tunisia, are close to 10$/c. These values partly coincide with the share in world markets. Spain has the highest share, 14%. The second most important country is Turkey with a share of 3.9%. Greece and Egypt are the only other countries with a shares higher than 1% at about 1.2% each, though Morocco is close with a share of slightly below 1%. The shares of the remaining countries are marginal.

All countries but Jordan display high and positive RCA values for the fruit sector (Table A5). Jordan has a negative value of -1.1, which stands in strong contrast to its RCA top position in the vegetable sector. Israel has the second lowest value of 1.8, followed by Tunisia with 5.2. The remaining countries range from 9.5 for Greece to 16.5 for Morocco. Clearly, a majority of the countries display substantial revealed comparative advantages

within the fruit sector and in a majority of the cases, the RCA is higher for fruit than for vegetables. At the disaggregated level, all countries but Turkey display low or even negative values for nuts. For oranges, Morocco excels with a value of nearly 6 while Cyprus, Greece and Spain display values between 2.5 and 3.5.

For five of the countries, the RUV are above unity at an aggregated level (Table A6). Only one of the countries, Tunisia, has a value higher than 2 while the other's range from 1.1 to 1.5. Egypt has the lowest value of 0.4. The trend is clearly positive though for all countries but Tunisia, Egypt and Turkey. At the disaggregated level, the values are closer to unity for most of the countries and commodities. Egypt is the main exception with low values for all three commodities. Tunisia has a low value for nuts, whereas Turkey has low values for dates and oranges. Regarding oranges, Tunisia has the highest value of 2.4, follow by Spain with 1.4. The highest RUV at the disaggregated level is Israeli dates with a value of 6.4, dates also being the most exported Israeli fruit. In export terms, dates is also an important fruit for Tunisia, which displays a RUV of 1.8.

**CMS analysis I**

**Vegetables**

The upper part of Table A7 displays the absolute change in vegetable exports, the absolute CMS effects as well as the relative CMS effects. Egypt, Cyprus and Turkey display a poor absolute performance with declining exports over *'P-T'*. The lack of growth is serious since total world exports have increased: if the three countries had increased their exports by just the same ratio as world imports have increased, their exports would have increased substantially. This effect is reflected in the market size effect. Since the world market grows, all countries display a positive market size effect. Only Morocco, Jordan and Spain

manage to increase exports faster than world growth though, resulting in *"MS%"* being lower than 100%. Of the growing countries, Tunisia increases its exports the least relative to the market size effect, thus having the highest *"MS%"*. Only three of the countries, Jordan, Spain and Greece, display positive commodity composition effects, indicating that they have focused their exports on relatively fast growing commodities. On the other end of the spectrum are Tunisia, Egypt and Turkey with highly negative values, indicating that those countries have focused their exports on slowly growing commodities. Morocco's and Cyprus' values are close to zero, indicating that the countries' export patterns are similar to the world average with respect to export growth. All countries display positive and high market distribution effects resulting in *"MD%"* values far above zero. Thus, all countries that increased their exports during *'P-T'* had concentrated their exports to countries that grew relatively fast. Surprisingly, all countries display a negative competitiveness effect. Spain and Morocco perform the best with *"CE%"* values of about -100%. As noted above, they manage to increase exports at about the same rate as world exports grow. However, they do not manage to utilize the advantage they initially had since they were exporting to countries that grew relatively fast over the period. Thus, Spain and Morocco would have had to increase their exports twice as much as they did in order to avoid a negative competitiveness effect. As can be seen in the table, all other countries perform far worse with respect to competitiveness.

Comparing the development of *'P-1'* with *'P-2'*, we find that the export development differs for many of the countries between the phases. The absolute export change is negative for Tunisia, Egypt and Jordan in the first phase but becomes positive in the second phase. Tunisia and Jordan display remarkable changes: in the second phase, the declining absolute exports have been transformed into an *"MS%"* value of 44% and 43% respectively, while

the *"CE%"* values are -11% and -69%. Just over half of the countries for which there is data for both phases experience a decreasing competitiveness effect from phase one to phase two. Israel and Lebanon, the two countries for which there is data only for phase two, have both focused their exports on slowly growing commodities but fast growing partners. Israel increases its exports faster than the world average though while Lebanon grows more slowly than the world average. Both countries have a negative competitiveness effect.

**Fruit**

The lower part of Table A7 displays the results of the CMS analysis for fruit. Notably, no conclusions can be deducted from the vegetable sector regarding how the countries perform in the fruit sector. Morocco, Tunisia and Spain have positive export changes for both types of products while Cyprus has a negative export change for both types of commodities. The other countries perform well for one of the commodities and poorly for the other. Jordan, Cyprus and Greece display a poor absolute performance with declining exports over *'P-T'*. In general, the countries do not perform as well in the fruit sector as they did in the vegetable sector: Egypt is the only country that increases its exports that displays *"MS%"* lower than 100%, Morocco being the second best country with an *"MS%"* value of 148%. Likewise, the best relative competitiveness effects are clearly lower than those for vegetables are.

A major difference between fruit and vegetables is that in the fruit sector, several countries, including Morocco, Egypt, Turkey and Greece, switch from a positive change in exports in *'P-1'* to a negative in *'P-2'*. The three countries that have a positive change in exports in the second phase, Tunisia, Lebanon and Spain, increase their exports faster than the world average, resulting in *"MS%"* of 50%, 95% and 75%, respectively. The market distribution

effect outweighs the market size effect though, resulting in a negative competitiveness effect. Spain is the country with the best relative competitiveness effect over the *'P-T'*, -207%, followed by Egypt of -300%. Out of the countries with a positive change in exports, Tunisia performs the worst with *"CE%"* of -820%.

Both of the countries that perform poorly in *'P-1'* with respect to absolute export changes have a negative export change in *'P-2'* as well. Tunisia and Spain are the only countries that continue to have positive export changes. The market distribution effect is positive for all countries in both phases. Regarding the commodity composition effect, all countries but Tunisia display a negative effect in the first phase. In the second phase, the pattern is more diverse as only half of the countries display a negative effect.

The country that improves the most from *'P-1'* to *'P-2'* is Tunisia. The relative market size effect falls from over 5000% to just less than 50%. At the same time does the *"CE%"* increase from -9500% to only -410%. Egypt, on the other hand, is one of the major losers: in phase one, $\Delta X_c$ is positive and *"MS%"* only 34% with a *"CE%"* of -24%. In phase two, $\Delta X_c$ is substantially negative and *"CE%"* has decreased to -470%.

**CMS analysis II**

In the preceding section, the analysis has been based on exports to the world market. As clarified in the methodology section, there might however be good reasons to perform the CMS analysis on the regions that are the major trading partners. Since the EU member countries are the major export outlets for many of the Mediterranean countries, a separate CMS analysis has been performed on the investigated countries export performances to the European Union, defined as EU15. The results are displayed in Table A8.

Interestingly, there are few major changes. That is not particularly surprising though, considering that the European Union is a very large player in world trade, especially with respect to trade in fruit and vegetables (Huang 2004). There is one striking difference though: Two of the countries, Tunisia and Jordan, display a positive competitiveness effect for the vegetables sector over *'P-2'*. Investigating that result further, we find that both countries increase exports at more than twice the rate needed to keep up with the general increase in EU imports. That is, *"MS%"* is just below 40% for both countries. We further find that the two countries have had to deal with a disadvantage with respect to commodity composition. Tunisia and Jordan had a focus on slowly growing commodities in *'P-1'*, resulting in negative *"CC%"* equal to -35 and -19, respectively. On the other hand, both countries had an initial export pattern focusing on markets that were growing relatively fast. This is especially the case for Tunisia with a *"MD%"* of 56. The *"MD%"* for Jordan is lower and equal to 20. All factors taken together, Jordan had less help of initial export promoting patterns relative to its increase in exports and thus has a higher relative competitiveness effect than Tunisia. The *"CE%"* of Jordan is 75, indicating that three quarters of its increase in exports is due to increasing competitiveness. For Tunisia, the value is only 25. As pointed to above, a large share of Tunisia's increase in exports stem from a favourable market distribution and only a quarter of the increase is attributable to increasing competitiveness.

# 4 Discussion and conclusions

Starting with the results from CMS I, one can immediately note that all countries perform poorly with respect to competitiveness for both commodities and all phases. The competitiveness effect is always negative, but the divergence between countries, phases and commodities is substantial.

Despite the negative competitiveness effect, most countries are doing well in the second phase, increasing exports of vegetables much faster than the constant market share norm. Only Cyprus and Turkey, which decrease exports, perform badly. The negative competitiveness effect is attributable to the market distribution effect: Although the countries grow faster than the world average, they should have increased exports even faster in order to keep up with the markets and commodities they are exporting. Contrasting to the initial phase, the export improvement is obvious: in the first phase, none of the countries grew faster than the world average. The recovery in the second phase secures that three out of eight countries manage to grow faster than the world over the entire phase.

The fruit sectors of the countries do not perform as well as the vegetable sectors. Furthermore, the fruit sectors generally do better in the first rather than the second phase. In the second phase, only three of the countries, Tunisia, Lebanon and Spain, display a positive growth in absolute terms. Those countries manage to grow much faster than the general world growth though. Despite that, the competitiveness effect is negative for the same reasons as it was for the vegetable sectors. They perform well but not as well as they should have, the market distribution effects outweigh the absolute increase in exports. Contrasting to the first phase, six out of the eight countries display a positive growth but only one

country grows faster than the world average. In that respect, the performances of the fruit sectors resemble those of the vegetable sectors.

In general, there are no major differences between using the world or the European Union as the base in the CMS analysis. The patterns are in general similar and there are only six instances when the absolute export change switches from positive to negative or vice versa. Clearly, the most interesting difference is that Jordan and Tunisia in the latter phase display a positive competitiveness for the vegetable sector. This implies that the choice of destination markets affects the results of the CMS analysis and that the analyst should consider the options.

The results from the CMS analysis II of vegetables can be related to some of the results of Martínez Gómez & Álvarez-Coque (2005). Using different periods (1995/1996-2000/2001), they find the competitiveness effect of Egypt and Turkey to be negative over the period while the effects of Spain and Morocco are only slightly positive. One general conclusion of Martínez Gómez & Álvarez-Coque (2005), partly giving support to our results, is that European countries are losing competitiveness. More interesting though, is that they find the 'country preference effect', which corresponds to the market distribution effect, to be clearly positive for Spain, Egypt and Turkey. It is also evident that the choice of periods is important: for example, while the 1995/1996-2000/2001 phase shows a decline of 42% for Egyptian vegetable exports, phase two in our study displays a substantial increase in absolute terms.

Relating the revealed comparative advantage values to the CMS analysis for phase two, one can conclude that high and positive RCA values do not necessarily correspond to a positive

competitiveness effects. Furthermore, the RCA values correspond poorly to relative market size effects. Indeed, in six cases in phase two, CMS I, do high RCA values correspond to increasing exports in absolute terms and *"MS%"* below 100. That is the same number of cases as those that display high RCA values and negative growth in absolute terms. Likewise, Tunisian vegetables, one of the countries/commodities that performs the best with low *"MS%"* and only slightly negative *"CE%"* when the world is the base and a positive *"CE%"* when the EU is the base, has the second worst RCA value of all countries/commodities. Clearly, high RCA values do not necessarily imply that countries manage to utilize their potentials.

The results of this study are somewhat surprising, as it would have been expected that more of the countries displayed a positive competitiveness. Since that is not the case, one has to ask why it might be that the countries, despite potentials, do not perform better. One general point in that case that is relevant for the non-European Union countries is the fact that the EU demands high sanitary standards on producers that wish to export to the union. The issue of food safety standards has been studied by Muaz (2005) who finds that there is a high cost involved in meeting the standards. There are several sources of those costs, including infrastructure and lack of qualified personnel. These costs may be one reason why the Mediterranean countries do not succeed as well in exporting as they could be expected to. Further studies are necessary though to safely assess the basis of the low competitiveness factor. The relatively poor competitiveness of the European Union member countries Spain and Greece could on the other hand be attributable to the very favorable treatment they have by being members of the EU. Given the very positive influence access to the EU is bound to have on the countries, beating the market size and market distribution effects may be difficult.

To conclude, it appears as if most of the Mediterranean countries perform less well than they should be given their potentials. Although quite some countries manage to increase their share in world/EU imports, that is largely an effect of positive market distribution effects. Apparently, most of the countries depend on favorable historical export patterns for their successes in recent years. Without such an advantage, it is likely that the deterioration of the competitiveness would have led to less advantageous export changes.

# References


Ahmadi-Esfahani F.Z., 1993. An analysis of Egyptian wheat imports: a constant market shares approach. *Oxford Agrarian Studies* 21:31-39.

Ahmadi-Esfahani F.Z., 2006. Constant market share analysis: uses, limitation and prospects. *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics* 50:510-526.

Armington P.S., 1969. A theory for demand of products distinguished by place of production. *IMF Staff Papers* 16:159-178.

Balassa B., 1965. Trade liberalization and "revealed" comparative advantage. *The Manchester School* 33(2): 327-345.

Ballingall J., Briggs P., 2001. A comparison of Australia's and New Zealand's export performance using shift and share analysis. Working paper 01/05, NZ Institute of Economic Research:Wellington.

Briggs P., Bishop P., Fan E., 2001. New Zealand's economic growth: Why has it been low?.Working Paper 01/02, NZ Institute of Economic Research:Wellington.

Brownie S., Dalziel P., 1993. Shift-share analyses of New Zealand's exports 1970-84. *New Zealand Economic Papers* 27:233-249.

CEPII 1998. *Compétitivité des Nations*. Economica:Paris.

Chaptea A., Gaulier G., Zignago S., 2005. World Trade Competitiveness : A Disaggregated View by Shift-Share analysis. Working Paper No 2005-23, CEPII:Paris.

Chebbi H.E., Gil J.M., 2002. Position competitive des exportations tunisiennes de dattes sur le marché européen : une analyse shift-share. *New Medit* 3/2002:40-47.

Drysdale P., Lu W., 1996. Australia's export performance in East Asia. Pacific Economic Paper, no. 259, Australia-Japanese Research Centre:Canberra.

Gallina A., 2005. New regionalism in the Mediterranean: towards a Meso-regional approach. *New Medit* 1/2005:21-28.

García Alvarez-Coque J-M., 2002. Agricultural trade and the Barcelona Process : is full liberalisation possible? *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 29(3):399-422.

García Alvarez-Coque J.M., Bautista R.M., 1994. Sources of EC horticultural import growth from developing countries. *Agricultural Economics* 10:125-141.

Gazel R., Schwer R.K., 1998. Growth of international exports among the states: Can a modified shift-share analysis explain it? *International Regional Science Review* 21(2):185-204.

Huang S.W., 2004. Global Trade Patterns in Fruit and Vegetables. Agriculture and Trade Report Number WRS-04-08. USDA.

Hayward D., Erickson R.A., 1995. The North American trade of U.S. states: A comparative analysis of industrial shipments 1983-91. *International Regional Science Review* 18(1):1-31.

Houston D.B., 1967. The shift and share analysis of regional growth: a critique. *Southern Economic Journal* 33:577-581.

International Trade Center (ITC) 2000. The Trade Performance Index. Background paper, April 2000. ITC, UNCTAD:Geneva.

Juswanto W., Mulyanti P., 2003. Indonesia's manufactured exports: a constant market share analysis. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Moneter* 6(2):97-106.

Knudsen, D.C., 2000. Shift-share-analysis: further examination of models for the description of economic change. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences* 34:177-198.

Kuiper M., dell'Aquila C., 2004. Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: State of Affairs and Key Policy and Research Issues. Enarpri.

Leamer E.E., Stern P.M., 1970. *Quantitative International Economics*. Allyn and Bacon:Boston.

Markou M., Stavri G., 2005. National Policy Report on Israel. MEDFROL project. Report available at "http://medfrol.maich.gr/".

Markusen A.R., Noponen H., Driessen K., 1991. International trade, productivity and U.S. regional job growth: A shift-share interpretation. *International Regional Science Review* 14(1):15-39.

Martínez Gómez V.D., García Álvarez-Coque J.M., 2005. Vegetable trade flows between the European Union and it Mediterranean partners: an analysis of the influence of preferences and competitiveness. *New Medit* 2/2005:4-10.

Merkies A.H.Q.M., van der Meer T., 1988. A theoretical foundation for Constant Market Share Analysis. *Empirical Economics* 13:65-80.

Michel B., 2005. Trends in export market shares between 1991 and 2001. Working paper 7-05. Federal Planning Bureau:Brussels.

Muaz S., 2004. The Impact of Euro-Mediterranean Partnership on the Agricultural Sectors of Jordan, Palestine, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt (The Case of Horticultural Exports to EU Markets). Research no FEM21-03. FEMISE.

Muaz S., 2005. An Economic Analysis of Food Safety Standards and its Implication on Agricultural Trade in the Context of EU-MED Partnership "The case of SPS Standards and EUREPGAP Requirements". Research no FEM22-12. FEMISE.

Richardsson J.D., 1971a. Some sensitivity tests for a "constant-market-shares" analysis of export growth. *Review of Economics and Statistics* LIII:300-304.

Richardsson J.D., 1971b. Constant-market-shares analysis of export growth. *Journal of International Economics* 1:227-239.

Rigaux L. R., 1971. Market Share Analysis Applied to Canadian Wheat Exports. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics* 19(1):22-34.

Tyszynski H., 1951. World trade in manufactured commodities, 1899-1950. *The Manchester school of economic and social studies* 19:272-304.

Veeman M.M., Veeman T.S., Dong X-Y., 1991. Accounting for Export Market Performance of Major Wheat Exporters: A Constant Market Share Analysis. Poster paper presented at the XXI International Association of Agricultural Economists, Tokyo, Japan. August 22-29, 1991.

Vlachos I.P., 2001. Comparative advantage and uncertainty in the international trade of Mediterranean agricultural products: an empirical analysis. *New Medit* 4/2001:42-49.

# Appendixes

**Table A2: The most important agricultural commodities in export value in 2002 (US$ 1000).**

| | All agricultural commodities ¤ | Export value | Vegetables* | HS code | Export value | Fruit* | HS code | Export value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MAR | Tang.Mand.Clem.Sats | 110 292 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 100 357 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 194 449 |
| | Tomatoes | 100 393 | Leguminous veg | 0708 | 34 042 | Fruits nes | 0810 | 22 759 |
| | Oranges | 83 961 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 24 645 | Fruits and nuts | 0811 | 16 904 |
| TUN | Dates | 68 621 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 1 889 | Dates, figs etc | 0804 | 68 716 |
| | Oil of Olive | 39 268 | Vegetables dried | 0712 | 1 434 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 8 436 |
| | Oil of Maize | 30 383 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 574 | Fruit, dried, nes | 0813 | 3 461 |
| EGY | Cotton Lint | 329 698 | Potatoes | 0701 | 42 808 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 36 521 |
| | Milled Paddy Rice | 103 348 | Onions, shallots etc | 0703 | 24 979 | Dates, figs etc | 0804 | 2 946 |
| | Potatoes | 42 617 | Vegetables frozen | 0710 | 20 096 | Grapes | 0806 | 2 171 |
| ISR | Avocados | 42 703 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 76 274 | Dates, figs etc | 0804 | 58 979 |
| | Chillies&Peppers, Green | 38 306 | Potatoes | 0701 | 29 456 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 57 909 |
| | Vegetables Fresh nes | 36 790 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 27 819 | Fruits nes | 0810 | 26 225 |
| JOR | Oils Hydrogenated | 91 858 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 59 167 | Melons | 0807 | 5 565 |
| | Tomatoes | 59 167 | Cucumbers | 0707 | 22 439 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 5 257 |
| | Dry Skim Cow Milk | 53 107 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 19 559 | Stone fruit | 0809 | 2 872 |
| LBN | Beverages Non-Alcoholic | 12 463 | Potatoes | 0701 | 13 608 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 13 030 |
| | Oranges | 11 654 | Legumi. Veg. dried | 0713 | 1 629 | Apples, pears | 0808 | 5 085 |
| | Potatoes | 9 243 | Lettuce & chicory | 0705 | 1 247 | Fruit nes | 0810 | 3 863 |
| TUR | Hazelnuts Shelled | 361 003 | Legumi. Veg. dried | 0713 | 116 268 | Nuts exc coconut etc | 0802 | 411 336 |
| | Tobacco Leaves | 273 209 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 69 956 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 253 889 |
| | Preprd Nuts(Excl.Grnuts) | 169 590 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 36 943 | Grapes | 0806 | 188 779 |
| CYP | Cigarettes | 97 433 | Potatoes | 0701 | 18 189 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 29 983 |
| | Potatoes | 17 882 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 6 499 | Grapes | 0806 | 1 323 |
| | Beverages Dist Alcoholic | 11 021 | Legumi. Veg. dried | 0713 | 212 | Melons | 0807 | 558 |
| GRC | Oth. fruit & parts of plant | 288 349 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 76 154 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 167 504 |
| | Tobacco unmanuf | 232 340 | Cucumbers | 0707 | 20 796 | Grapes | 0806 | 102 121 |
| | Cotton lint | 203 956 | Vegetables frozen | 0710 | 11 540 | Stone fruit | 0809 | 66 575 |
| ESP | Wine | 1 215 237 | Vegetables nes | 0709 | 834 192 | Citrus fruit | 0805 | 2 174 429 |
| | Olive Oil virgin | 1 140 931 | Tomatoes | 0702 | 777 105 | Fruits nes | 0810 | 442 533 |
| | Tang. Mand Clem | 956 345 | Lettuce & chicory | 0705 | 392 446 | Stone fruit | 0809 | 440 092 |

Source * COMTRADE data ¤FAO

**Table A3: Main destination of exports**

| | Fruit 1997 | | Fruit 2003 | | Vegetables 1997 | | Vegetables 2003 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Destination | Share | Destination | Share | Destination | Share | Destination | Share |
| MAR | France | 30.7 | France | 21.6 | France | 63.3 | France | 67.0 |
| | Germany | 14.0 | Russian Federation | 20.9 | Germany | 4.3 | Spain | 12.8 |
| | Russian Federation | 12.4 | United Kingdom | 10.7 | Japan | 4.1 | Italy | 3.4 |
| | United Kingdom | 9.1 | Netherlands | 9.7 | Italy | 4.0 | USA | 2.8 |
| | Belgium-Luxembourg | 5.6 | Belgium | 6.9 | Spain | 3.9 | Switzerland | 2.5 |
| TUN | France | 42.0 | France | 40.8 | France | 47.4 | France | 52.4 |
| | Italy | 17.5 | Italy | 12.1 | Germany | 27.0 | Italy | 29.1 |
| | Germany | 9.2 | Germany | 9.9 | Libya | 12.3 | Germany | 11.8 |
| | United Kingdom | 7.2 | Spain | 8.6 | Areas, nes | 6.3 | Libya | 2.0 |
| | Spain | 6.3 | Morocco | 6.8 | Belgium-Luxembourg | 2.1 | United Kingdom | 1.4 |
| EGY | Saudi Arabia | 24.0 | Russian Federation | 33.3 | Saudi Arabia | 17.9 | Italy | 15.4 |
| | Russian Federation | 23.0 | Belarus | 12.1 | United Kingdom | 16.8 | Germany | 12.7 |
| | United Kingdom | 8.1 | United Kingdom | 8.9 | Germany | 14.3 | Saudi Arabia | 11.5 |
| | Ukraine | 5.8 | Saudi Arabia | 8.4 | Lebanon | 10.0 | Greece | 8.9 |
| | Kuwait | 4.8 | Ukraine | 7.9 | Italy | 6.3 | Russian Federation | 7.4 |
| ISR | United Kingdom | 23.8 | United Kingdom | 24.4 | United Kingdom | 22.9 | United Kingdom | 27.8 |
| | Belgium-Luxembourg | 15.7 | France | 16.1 | USA | 17.6 | Netherlands | 21.5 |
| | France | 14.0 | Netherlands | 11.9 | Netherlands | 17.5 | USA | 17.3 |
| | Japan | 8.2 | Germany | 6.1 | Germany | 11.3 | Germany | 8.1 |
| | Germany | 5.0 | Belgium | 5.2 | France | 11.2 | France | 6.0 |
| JOR | Saudi Arabia | 37.7 | Syria | 15.6 | United Arab Emirates | 33.8 | United Arab Emirates | 32.2 |
| | United Arab Emirates | 23.1 | Kuwait | 14.0 | Kuwait | 20.7 | Syria | 19.1 |
| | Kuwait | 13.5 | Lebanon | 12.3 | Lebanon | 20.4 | Kuwait | 12.8 |
| | Qatar | 10.9 | Bahrain | 9.6 | Qatar | 11.8 | Bahrain | 8.4 |
| | Bahrain | 8.4 | United Arab Emirates | 9.1 | Bahrain | 9.2 | Qatar | 8.1 |
| LBN | Saudi Arabia | 30.6 | Saudi Arabia | 29.3 | Saudi Arabia | 48.5 | Saudi Arabia | 18.8 |
| | Kuwait | 13.3 | Kuwait | 15.2 | Kuwait | 16.8 | Syria | 18.3 |
| | Jordan | 12.8 | Egypt | 14.3 | United Arab Emirates | 16.7 | Kuwait | 17.7 |
| | Egypt | 10.8 | Syria | 11.0 | Jordan | 8.1 | Jordan | 16.0 |
| | Libya | 10.4 | United Arab Emirates | 9.3 | Qatar | 2.2 | United Arab Emirates | 14.9 |
| TUR | Germany | 31.1 | Germany | 18.3 | Areas, nes | 22.0 | Iraq | 13.5 |
| | Italy | 10.0 | Italy | 10.9 | Germany | 9.3 | Germany | 10.5 |
| | United Kingdom | 8.2 | Russian Federation | 8.6 | Russian Federation | 8.7 | Russian Federation | 8.8 |
| | France | 6.7 | United Kingdom | 7.9 | Saudi Arabia | 6.6 | Saudi Arabia | 5.4 |
| | Netherlands | 5.7 | France | 7.1 | Egypt | 4.7 | Greece | 4.7 |
| CYP | United Kingdom | 37.9 | United Kingdom | 29.8 | United Kingdom | 41.5 | Germany | 35.3 |
| | Germany | 13.9 | Germany | 14.4 | Germany | 34.7 | United Kingdom | 30.1 |
| | Italy | 6.9 | Czech Rep. | 10.5 | Belgium-Luxembourg | 7.0 | Belgium | 9.4 |
| | Austria | 6.4 | Italy | 8.5 | Norway | 4.1 | Greece | 5.9 |
| | France | 4.8 | Slovakia | 6.1 | Denmark | 2.5 | Norway | 4.6 |
| GRC | Germany | 20.6 | Germany | 19.2 | Germany | 62.7 | Germany | 50.2 |
| | United Kingdom | 17.7 | United Kingdom | 12.1 | Italy | 14.5 | Italy | 14.2 |
| | Netherlands | 9.3 | Poland | 7.1 | Netherlands | 4.2 | United Kingdom | 6.2 |
| | Russian Federation | 8.1 | Netherlands | 6.5 | Bunkers | 3.3 | Austria | 4.3 |
| | Italy | 7.0 | Italy | 6.3 | Albania | 3.1 | Netherlands | 4.0 |
| ESP | Germany | 27.5 | Germany | 24.2 | Germany | 24.6 | Germany | 27.1 |
| | France | 23.0 | France | 23.5 | United Kingdom | 19.3 | United Kingdom | 19.2 |
| | Italy | 9.9 | Italy | 9.9 | France | 18.7 | France | 18.6 |
| | United Kingdom | 8.6 | United Kingdom | 9.7 | Netherlands | 17.0 | Netherlands | 11.1 |
| | Netherlands | 8.5 | Netherlands | 6.6 | Italy | 4.8 | Italy | 5.7 |

Source: COMTRADE data

**Table A4: Trade performance and specialization.**

| Vegetables HS07 | MAR | TUN | EGY | ISR | JOR | LBN | TUR | CYP | GRC | ESP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Value of exports ($ 000) | 256 600 | 5 283 | 133 600 | 235 500 | 136 600 | 17 152 | 473 300 | 38 988 | 111 400 | 3 888 000 |
| Trend of exports (95-03) p.a. | 2.69% | 2.74% | 0.15% | 3.30% | 10.23% | 0.94% | -0.21% | -2.51% | 1.86% | 6.60% |
| Share in national export | 2.92% | 0.07% | 1.78% | 0.75% | 4.43% | 1.13% | 1.00% | 4.22% | 0.81% | 2.46% |
| Value of net exports ($ 000) | 223 110 | -19 827 | -30 674 | 191 415 | 102 811 | -38 103 | 443 245 | 26 254 | -78 009 | 3 173 813 |
| Per capita exports ($/inhb) | 8.39 | 0.54 | 1.86 | 36.61 | 24.96 | 4.7 | 6.64 | 48.61 | 10.15 | 94.68 |
| Share in world market | 0.95% | 0.02% | 0.96% | 0.88% | 0.51% | 0.06% | 1.76% | 0.14% | 0.41% | 14.45% |
| Fruit HS08 | MAR | TUN | EGY | ISR | JOR | LBN | TUR | CYP | GRC | ESP |
| Value of exports ($ 000) | 320 600 | 87 537 | 52 522 | 191 800 | 20 015 | 31 144 | 1 392 000 | 40 599 | 445 100 | 5 047 000 |
| Trend of exports (95-03) p.a. | 1.62% | 1.01% | 9.65% | -3.57% | -5.46% | 0.18% | 0.78% | -1.03% | -0.35% | 4.43% |
| Share in national export | 3.65% | 1.19% | 0.70% | 0.60% | 0.65% | 2.04% | 2.95% | 4.40% | 3.26% | 3.19% |
| Value of net exports ($ 000) | 297 078 | 75 775 | 14 586 | 109 523 | -30 703 | -37 174 | 1 311 642 | 27 898 | 168 480 | 3 820 819 |
| Per capita exports ($/inhb) | 10.49 | 8.90 | 0.73 | 29.81 | 3.66 | 8.53 | 19.52 | 50.62 | 40.55 | 122.91 |
| Share in world market | 0.90% | 0.25% | 1.22% | 0.54% | 0.06% | 0.09% | 3.90% | 0.11% | 1.25% | 14.14% |

Source: COMTRADE. Data for 2003 unless otherwise stated.

**Table A5: RCA indices for selected fruit and vegetables.**

| | **Fruit** | Nuts | Oranges | **Vegetables** | Potatoes | Tomatoes | Cucumbers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | HS 08 | HS 0802 | HS 080510 | HS 07 | HS 0701 | HS 0702 | HS 0707 |
| Morocco | 16.46 | 0.23 | 5.87 | 12.69 | -0.02 | 6.4 | 0.07 |
| Tunisia | 5.24 | -0.19 | 0.61 | -0.86 | -0.76 | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Egypt | na | na | na | na | na | na | na |
| Israel | 1.81 | -0.72 | 0.2 | 3.06 | 0.45 | 0.62 | 0.00 |
| Jordan | -1.13 | -0.94 | -0.64 | 17.51 | -0.39 | 8.1 | 3.15 |
| Lebanon | 3.15 | -1.59 | 1.62 | 1.03 | 1.46 | 0.05 | -0.03 |
| Turkey | 13.65 | 4.51 | 0.56 | 4.62 | 0.13 | 0.9 | 0.11 |
| Cyprus | 11.68 | -0.09 | 2.58 | 11.18 | 8.74 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
| Greece | 9.45 | -0.27 | 3.52 | 1.41 | -0.28 | -0.13 | 0.43 |
| Spain | 12.78 | 0.09 | 2.83 | 10.38 | -0.11 | 2.69 | 0.96 |

Source: ITC

**Table A6: The Relative Unit Value in 2003 and its average annual change 1993 – 2003**

| | | MAR | TUN | EGY | ISR | JOR | LBN | TUR | CYP | GRC | ESP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vegetables | RUV | 1.56 | 0.89 | 0.42 | 2.63 | 0.78 | 0.25 | 0.85 | 0.96 | 3.15 | 2.15 |
| HS07 | avr chg % | 3.77 | -1.95 | -3.30 | 4.91 | 1.30 | -2.80 | -0.38 | 3.09 | 5.48 | 0.86 |
| Potatoes | RUV | 1.74 | 0.53 | 0.71 | 1.53 | 1.37 | 0.46 | 0.45 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 1.48 |
| HS0701 | avr chg % | 0.08 | -13.30 | -2.20 | 3.50 | -1.12 | -6.58 | -8.10 | -2.97 | -3.70 | 0.92 |
| Tomatoes | RUV | 0.92 | 0.76 | 0.35 | 2.78 | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.56 | 1.81 | 0.51 | 1.33 |
| HS0702 | avr chg % | 8.34 | -3.10 | 2.20 | 2.30 | 2.30 | -7.60 | -0.30 | -0.70 | -6.90 | 3.20 |
| Cucumbers | RUV | 0.80 | 2.39 | 0.81 | 3.50 | 0.89 | 1.59 | 0.98 | 4.51 | 3.10 | 2.01 |
| HS0707 | avr chg % | 3.70 | 5.94 | 0.41 | 10.80 | 5.09 | 9.87 | -1.10 | 8.20 | 10.20 | 4.94 |
| Fruit | RUV | 0.89 | 2.42 | 0.37 | 1.22 | 0.66 | 0.20 | 1.48 | 0.80 | 1.07 | 1.38 |
| HS08 | avr chg % | 6.27 | -5.30 | -4.35 | 15.00 | 2.36 | -4.10 | -1.86 | 2.83 | 4.82 | 3.19 |
| Nuts | RUV | 1.07 | 0.26 | 0.16 | na | 0.99 | 0.79 | 1.04 | 1.20 | 1.31 | 1.33 |
| HS0802 | avr chg % | 4.81 | -7.40 | 1.89 | na | 0.83 | 7.07 | 0.53 | 0.13 | -0.10 | -1.10 |
| Dates | RUV | 0.93 | 1.78 | 0.38 | 6.15 | 0.67 | 0.99 | 0.67 | 3.15 | 2.92 | 3.07 |
| HS080410 | avr chg % | 4.60 | 2.20 | 4.09 | 21.10 | 9.55 | 2.66 | 13.20 | na | 5.10 | 4.60 |
| Oranges | RUV | 0.84 | 2.42 | 0.47 | 1.11 | 1.13 | 0.22 | 0.67 | 1.02 | 0.91 | 1.35 |
| HS080510 | avr chg % | 2.45 | 15.50 | -4.79 | 5.61 | 0.91 | -0.29 | -1.86 | 2.40 | 5.70 | 3.37 |

RUV for ISR refer to 2000. Avr annual change for ISR refer to 1996-2000. Avr annual change for JOR refer to 1994-2003.

RUV for EGY refer to 2002. Avr annual change for EGY refer to 1994-2002.

Source: COMTRADE data

**Table A7: CMS analysis I, World base.**

| | | | Morocco | Tunisia | Egypt | Israel | Jordan | Lebanon | Turkey | Cyprus | Greece | Spain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vegetables HS 07 | Period 1 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 112 000 | 446 | -7 099 | | 26 600 | | -11 700 | -20 100 | 35 500 | 1 810 000 |
| | | MS | 88 100 | 3 905 | 40 400 | | 22 100 | | 344 000 | 46 700 | 75 500 | 1 590 000 |
| | | CC | -1 534 | -337 | -27 000 | | 7 656 | | -31 600 | -518 | 3 288 | 486 000 |
| | | MD | 140 000 | 1 831 | 140 000 | | 87 100 | | 366 000 | 59 500 | 64 400 | 1 640 000 |
| | | CE | -114 000 | -4 953 | -161 000 | | -90 200 | | -689 000 | -126 000 | -108 000 | -1 910 000 |
| | | MSrel | 78.55 | 876.18 | 569.76 | | 83.07 | | 2946.75 | 232.87 | 213.03 | 87.91 |
| | | CCrel | -1.37 | -75.56 | -380.74 | | 28.74 | | -271.41 | -2.58 | 9.27 | 26.90 |
| | | MDrel | 124.76 | 410.85 | 1975.71 | | 326.97 | | 3136.02 | 296.78 | 181.58 | 90.89 |
| | | CErel | -101.94 | -1111.47 | -2264.72 | | -338.78 | | -5911.36 | -627.07 | -303.89 | -105.70 |
| | Period 1 - Period 2 | ΔXc | 61 100 | -1 773 | -25 000 | | -25 400 | | 9 629 | -15 700 | 34 700 | 995 000 |
| | | MS | 73 000 | 1 232 | 7 202 | | 2 987 | | 220 000 | 19 200 | 69 100 | 1 620 000 |
| | | CC | -27 600 | 1 261 | -15 200 | | 2 790 | | 16 800 | 12 100 | -25 600 | -464 000 |
| | | MD | 141 000 | 5 362 | 128 000 | | 66 100 | | 276 000 | 55 700 | 72 700 | 1 710 000 |
| | | CE | -126 000 | -9 628 | -145 000 | | -97 300 | | -503 000 | -103 000 | -81 600 | -1 880 000 |
| | | MSrel | 119.50 | 69.50 | 28.75 | | 11.76 | | 2288.14 | 122.58 | 199.10 | 163.06 |
| | | CCrel | -45.20 | 71.12 | -60.83 | | 10.98 | | 173.96 | 77.03 | -73.70 | -46.62 |
| | | MDrel | 231.30 | 302.41 | 509.83 | | 260.19 | | 2863.30 | 356.15 | 209.49 | 172.21 |
| | | CErel | -205.60 | -543.02 | -577.75 | | -382.93 | | -5225.40 | -655.77 | -234.89 | -188.65 |
| | Period 2 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 51 100 | 2 219 | 17 900 | 53 900 | 52 000 | 2 763 | -21 300 | -4 398 | 741 | 813 000 |
| | | MS | 57 100 | 982 | 27 700 | 45 800 | 22 500 | 4 226 | 76 400 | 6 057 | 25 700 | 790 000 |
| | | CC | -6 318 | -489 | -10 400 | -10 100 | -10 100 | -849 | -34 100 | 44 | 8 020 | 68 600 |
| | | MD | 150 000 | 1 970 | 109 000 | 159 000 | 75 800 | 23 500 | 372 000 | 34 000 | 104 000 | 2 470 000 |
| | | CE | -150 000 | -245 | -108 000 | -141 000 | -36 200 | -24 100 | -436 000 | -44 500 | -137 000 | -2 520 000 |
| | | MSrel | 111.80 | 44.24 | 154.19 | 84.93 | 43.32 | 152.96 | 358.90 | 137.73 | 3468.63 | 97.11 |
| | | CCrel | -12.37 | -22.02 | -58.11 | -18.66 | -19.39 | -30.72 | -160.12 | 1.00 | 1081.97 | 8.43 |
| | | MDrel | 293.53 | 88.81 | 605.95 | 294.77 | 145.59 | 850.94 | 1747.50 | 772.62 | 13976.81 | 303.92 |
| | | CErel | -292.96 | -11.03 | -602.03 | -261.05 | -69.52 | -873.17 | -2046.28 | -1011.35 | -18427.41 | -309.45 |

| | | | Morocco | Tunisia | Egypt | Israel | Jordan | Lebanon | Turkey | Cyprus | Greece | Spain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fruit HS 08 | Period 1 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 83 200 | 20 800 | 9 215 | | -15 800 | | 366 000 | -6 849 | -16 600 | 1 690 000 |
| | | MS | 123 000 | 73 500 | 8 435 | | 9 572 | | 932 000 | 42 700 | 527 000 | 3 160 000 |
| | | CC | -41 600 | 45 600 | 812 | | -2 478 | | -16 400 | -15 600 | -9 986 | -628 000 |
| | | MD | 168 000 | 72 400 | 27 600 | | 34 700 | | 936 000 | 56 700 | 700 000 | 2 670 000 |
| | | CE | -166 000 | -171 000 | -27 700 | | -57 600 | | -1 490 000 | -90 600 | -1 230 000 | -3 510 000 |
| | | MSrel | 147.70 | 352.92 | 91.53 | | 60.47 | | 254.78 | 623.89 | 3167.70 | 186.17 |
| | | CCrel | -50.02 | 218.81 | 8.81 | | -15.65 | | -4.47 | -228.51 | -60.07 | -37.08 |
| | | MDrel | 202.19 | 347.35 | 299.83 | | 219.30 | | 255.72 | 827.45 | 4209.94 | 157.74 |
| | | CErel | -199.87 | -819.07 | -300.18 | | -364.12 | | -406.03 | -1322.84 | -7417.57 | -206.83 |
| | Period 1 - Period 2 | ΔXc | 104 000 | 1 310 | 22 600 | | -4 150 | | 394 000 | -6 695 | 48 600 | 1 080 000 |
| | | MS | 130 000 | 60 500 | 7 635 | | 3 614 | | 1 010 000 | 25 700 | 473 000 | 3 600 000 |
| | | CC | -71 900 | 4 730 | -3 545 | | -165 | | -367 000 | -5 297 | -105 000 | -1 720 000 |
| | | MD | 166 000 | 59 800 | 23 900 | | 25 700 | | 952 000 | 50 300 | 674 000 | 2 830 000 |
| | | CE | -120 000 | -124 000 | -5 337 | | -33 300 | | -1 200 000 | -77 400 | -993 000 | -3 630 000 |
| | | MSrel | 124.78 | 4616.69 | 33.76 | | 87.09 | | 255.57 | 383.66 | 973.84 | 332.94 |
| | | CCrel | -69.00 | 360.98 | -15.67 | | -3.98 | | -93.18 | -79.12 | -216.65 | -158.69 |
| | | MDrel | 159.75 | 4560.82 | 105.51 | | 619.11 | | 241.61 | 751.71 | 1387.28 | 261.61 |
| | | CErel | -115.53 | -9438.49 | -23.60 | | -802.22 | | -304.00 | -1156.24 | -2044.46 | -335.86 |
| | Period 2 - Period 3 | ΔXc | -21 000 | 19 500 | -13 400 | -64 300 | -11 700 | 3 623 | -28 200 | -154 | -65 200 | 613 000 |
| | | MS | 43 300 | 9 706 | 5 560 | 31 300 | 1 787 | 3 430 | 199 000 | 5 077 | 49 100 | 503 000 |
| | | CC | -15 800 | 17 200 | -332 | 15 400 | 824 | -3 | 14 900 | -1 863 | 32 300 | -4 589 |
| | | MD | 270 000 | 72 200 | 44 500 | 231 000 | 26 600 | 36 600 | 1 140 000 | 31 600 | 479 000 | 3 660 000 |
| | | CE | -318 000 | -79 600 | -63 100 | -342 000 | -40 900 | -36 400 | -1 380 000 | -35 000 | -625 000 | -3 550 000 |
| | | MSrel | 206.24 | 49.71 | 41.49 | 48.69 | 15.30 | 94.68 | 707.49 | 3306.77 | 75.31 | 82.12 |
| | | CCrel | -75.09 | 88.25 | -2.48 | 23.90 | 7.05 | -0.08 | 52.76 | -1213.82 | 49.60 | -0.75 |
| | | MDrel | 1285.78 | 369.76 | 332.04 | 359.01 | 227.91 | 1009.15 | 4053.67 | 20584.50 | 734.18 | 597.82 |
| | | CErel | -1516.93 | -407.72 | -471.05 | -531.60 | -350.26 | -1003.75 | -4913.92 | -22777.45 | -959.09 | -579.19 |
| | Baseperiod | | 9394 | 9293 | 9495 | | 9495 | | 9293 | 9293 | 9293 | 9293 |

Absolute values are in 1000 US$

MS - market size effect. CC - commodity distribution effect. MD - market distribution effect. CE - competitiveness effect.

Source: COMTRADE data

**Table A8: CMS analysis II, EU base.**

| | | | Morocco | Tunisia | Egypt | Israel | Jordan | Lebanon | Turkey | Cyprus | Greece | Spain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vegetables HS 07 | Period 1 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 95 300 | 1 251 | -15 800 | | 50 | | 9 561 | -20 300 | 29 100 | 1 670 000 |
| | | MS | 80 900 | 2 480 | 15 400 | | 889 | | 117 000 | 32 100 | 59 600 | 1 360 000 |
| | | CC | 5 916 | 538 | -19 400 | | 80 | | -21 300 | 19 100 | 4 654 | 653 000 |
| | | MD | 127 000 | 1 737 | 81 100 | | 2 135 | | 138 000 | 46 700 | 49 900 | 1 490 000 |
| | | CE | -118 000 | -3 504 | -92 900 | | -3 054 | | -224 000 | -118 000 | -85 100 | -1 840 000 |
| | | MSrel | 84.98 | 198.25 | 97.45 | | 1768.16 | | 1220.25 | 158.19 | 204.67 | 81.60 |
| | | CCrel | 6.21 | 43.03 | -122.96 | | 159.30 | | -222.77 | 94.22 | 15.98 | 39.12 |
| | | MDrel | 133.21 | 138.87 | 513.35 | | 4244.73 | | 1444.42 | 230.07 | 171.42 | 89.30 |
| | | CErel | -124.40 | -280.15 | -587.84 | | -6072.19 | | -2341.91 | -582.48 | -292.06 | -110.03 |
| | Period 1 - Period 2 | ΔXc | 34 500 | -1 072 | -22 400 | | -1 688 | | -18 100 | -16 200 | 34 600 | 912 000 |
| | | MS | 58 400 | 898 | -372 | | 22 | | 62 400 | 11 700 | 56 500 | 1 370 000 |
| | | CC | -12 700 | 1 149 | -12 600 | | 193 | | 21 300 | 25 600 | -20 600 | -234 000 |
| | | MD | 129 000 | 2 715 | 78 600 | | 1 955 | | 122 000 | 45 700 | 61 100 | 1 570 000 |
| | | CE | -140 000 | -5 835 | -88 100 | | -3 858 | | -224 000 | -99 300 | -62 400 | -1 790 000 |
| | | MSrel | 168.93 | 83.75 | -1.66 | | 1.32 | | 344.16 | 72.09 | 163.40 | 149.95 |
| | | CCrel | -36.90 | 107.13 | -55.97 | | 11.44 | | 117.36 | 157.95 | -59.69 | -25.64 |
| | | MDrel | 372.76 | 253.18 | 350.16 | | 115.83 | | 674.95 | 281.64 | 176.92 | 171.80 |
| | | CErel | -404.79 | -544.07 | -392.53 | | -228.59 | | -1236.46 | -611.68 | -180.64 | -196.12 |
| | Period 2 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 60 700 | 2 323 | 6 639 | 37 700 | 1 738 | 255 | 27 700 | -4 076 | -5 422 | 757 000 |
| | | MS | 50 000 | 866 | 12 800 | 31 100 | 683 | 108 | 30 100 | 5 115 | 21 000 | 693 000 |
| | | CC | -5 206 | -441 | -5 681 | -3 123 | -598 | -119 | -18 000 | -14 | 10 000 | 90 100 |
| | | MD | 123 000 | 1 308 | 59 100 | 115 000 | 343 | 348 | 113 000 | 28 300 | 89 700 | 2 350 000 |
| | | CE | -107 000 | 590 | -59 600 | -105 000 | 1 310 | -81 | -97 100 | -37 500 | -126 000 | -2 370 000 |
| | | MSrel | 82.35 | 37.27 | 192.36 | 82.43 | 39.29 | 42.18 | 108.76 | 125.49 | 386.46 | 91.57 |
| | | CCrel | -8.57 | -18.97 | -85.57 | -8.28 | -34.40 | -46.76 | -64.94 | -0.36 | 184.94 | 11.90 |
| | | MDrel | 203.10 | 56.30 | 890.25 | 305.01 | 19.75 | 136.49 | 406.90 | 695.02 | 1653.89 | 310.05 |
| | | CErel | -176.87 | 25.40 | -897.03 | -279.16 | 75.35 | -31.91 | -350.73 | -920.15 | -2325.29 | -313.53 |

| | | | Morocco | Tunisia | Egypt | Israel | Jordan | Lebanon | Turkey | Cyprus | Greece | Spain |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fruit HS 08 | Period 1 - Period 3 | ΔXc | 19 600 | 10 300 | 3 189 | | -457 | | 109 000 | -6 648 | -114 000 | 1 390 000 |
| | | MS | 81 400 | 55 600 | 1 112 | | 66 | | 694 000 | 33 600 | 396 000 | 3 060 000 |
| | | CC | -26 400 | 73 100 | -376 | | 0 | | -71 200 | -16 800 | 4 602 | -767 000 |
| | | MD | 146 000 | 47 200 | 4 568 | | 434 | | 598 000 | 48 400 | 278 000 | 2 270 000 |
| | | CE | -181 000 | -166 000 | -2 115 | | -957 | | -1 110 000 | -71 900 | -792 000 | -3 170 000 |
| | | MSrel | 415.28 | 542.87 | 34.86 | | 14.43 | | 638.42 | 506.14 | 347.48 | 220.05 |
| | | CCrel | -134.43 | 713.12 | -11.78 | | 0.00 | | -65.57 | -252.31 | 4.04 | -55.16 |
| | | MDrel | 744.12 | 460.54 | 143.24 | | 95.11 | | 550.12 | 727.94 | 244.11 | 163.20 |
| | | CErel | -924.97 | -1616.53 | -66.33 | | -209.54 | | -1022.97 | -1081.77 | -695.63 | -228.08 |
| | Period 1 - Period 2 | ΔXc | 50 600 | 399 | -309 | | 142 | | 260 000 | -4 761 | 12 500 | 942 000 |
| | | MS | 94 800 | 47 300 | 589 | | 68 | | 829 000 | 24 000 | 396 000 | 3 820 000 |
| | | CC | -45 100 | 32 900 | -118 | | -16 | | -293 000 | -7 890 | -24 400 | -1 860 000 |
| | | MD | 134 000 | 37 300 | 4 522 | | 491 | | 602 000 | 40 500 | 314 000 | 2 270 000 |
| | | CE | -133 000 | -117 000 | -5 302 | | -402 | | -878 000 | -61 300 | -646 000 | -3 290 000 |
| | | MSrel | 187.54 | 11842.73 | 190.55 | | 48.31 | | 318.96 | 503.84 | 2950.98 | 405.35 |
| | | CCrel | -89.23 | 8245.19 | -38.06 | | -11.21 | | -112.62 | -165.71 | -195.41 | -197.78 |
| | | MDrel | 264.39 | 9331.48 | 1464.07 | | 346.67 | | 231.70 | 850.30 | 2518.41 | 241.13 |
| | | CErel | -262.70 | -29319.40 | -1716.57 | | -283.76 | | -338.04 | -1288.42 | -5173.98 | -348.70 |
| | Period 2 - Period 3 | ΔXc | -31 000 | 9 851 | 3 498 | -37 400 | -598 | 84 | -151 000 | -1 886 | -126 000 | 448 000 |
| | | MS | 9 354 | 5 545 | 733 | 11 600 | 0 | 19 | 67 500 | 2 246 | 12 200 | 232 000 |
| | | CC | -3 792 | 13 800 | -570 | 13 700 | 15 | 5 | -19 600 | -1 937 | 7 533 | 2 300 |
| | | MD | 196 000 | 60 400 | 3 774 | 182 000 | 553 | 208 | 855 000 | 27 700 | 301 000 | 3 430 000 |
| | | CE | -232 000 | -69 900 | -439 | -244 000 | -1 167 | -148 | -1 050 000 | -29 900 | -447 000 | -3 210 000 |
| | | MSrel | 30.21 | 56.29 | 20.95 | 31.05 | 0.05 | 23.02 | 44.68 | 119.05 | 9.65 | 51.86 |
| | | CCrel | -12.25 | 139.73 | -16.31 | 36.69 | 2.57 | 5.69 | -12.98 | -102.71 | 5.96 | 0.51 |
| | | MDrel | 632.46 | 613.34 | 107.91 | 485.63 | 92.40 | 246.73 | 565.38 | 1469.68 | 238.36 | 765.48 |
| | | CErel | -750.42 | -709.35 | -12.55 | -653.37 | -195.02 | -175.44 | -697.07 | -1586.03 | -353.97 | -717.86 |
| | Baseperiod | | 9394 | 9293 | 9495 | | 9495 | | 9293 | 9293 | 9293 | 9293 |

Absolute values are in 1000 US$

MS - market size effect. CC - commodity distribution effect. MD - market distribution effect. CE - competitiveness effect.

Source: COMTRADE data

**Table A9: Categories of Vegetables and Fruit in the Harmonized System.**

| Vegetables | |
|---|---|
| 0701 | Potatoes, fresh or chilled |
| 0702 | Tomatoes, fresh or chilled |
| 0703 | Onions, shallots, garlic, leeks, etc. fresh or chilled |
| 0704 | Cabbage, cauliflower, kohlrabi & kale, fresh, chilled |
| 0705 | Lettuce and chicory, fresh or chilled |
| 0706 | Carrots, turnips, beetroot, etc. fresh or chilled |
| 0707 | Cucumbers and gherkins, fresh or chilled |
| 0708 | Leguminous vegetables, fresh or chilled |
| 0709 | Vegetables nes, fresh or chilled |
| 0710 | Vegetables (uncooked, steamed, boiled) frozen |
| 0711 | Vegetables provisionally preserved, not ready to eat |
| 0712 | Vegetables, dried, not further prepared |
| 0713 | Vegetables, leguminous dried, shelled |
| 0714 | Manioc, rowroot, salep etc, fresh, dried, sago pith |
| **Fruit** | |
| 0801 | Coconuts, Brazil nuts and cashew nuts, fresh or dried |
| 0802 | Nuts except coconut, brazil & cashew, fresh or dried |
| 0803 | Bananas, including plantains, fresh or dried |
| 0804 | Dates, figs, pineapple, avocado, guava, fresh or dried |
| 0805 | Citrus fruit, fresh or dried |
| 0806 | Grapes, fresh or dried |
| 0807 | Melons, watermelons and papaws (papayas), fresh |
| 0808 | Apples, pears and quinces, fresh |
| 0809 | Stone fruit, fresh (apricot, cherry, plum, peach, etc |
| 0810 | Fruit nes, fresh |
| 0811 | Fruit and nuts, uncooked boiled or steamed, frozen |
| 0812 | Fruit, nuts provisionally preserved, not ready to ea |
| 0813 | Fruit, dried, nes, dried fruit and nut mixtures |
| 0814 | Peel of citrus fruit or melons |

**Working Paper Series**

This Working Paper Series is one of several report series from the Department of Economics. A main purpose is to provide a forum for staff papers in a pre-journal stage. We expect our doctoral students to use this series as a means of publishing parts of future dissertations, such as theory, methodology, and interesting empirical results, in order to develop discussions in wider circles, demonstrate and insure originality. This series is of course also open to all staff members and visiting scholars.

Each author and the senior advisor take full responsibility for the quality and relevance of the content.

Previous issues are listed below and may be obtained, as far as supplies admit, from the Department.

2000

1 Hart, R. Dynamic control of stock pollutants: cost-effective responses to targets.

2 Hart, R. & Brady, M. Cost-effective control of stock pollutants: nitrogen in the Baltic sea.

3 Eriksson, C. & Persson, J. Inequality and the Environmental Kuznets Curve.

4 Gren, I-M. Pooling versus discriminating payments for environmental production by arable land.

5 Gren, I-M., Bussolo, M., Hill, M. & Pinelli, D. Ecological tax reforms and environmental benefits in Italy and Sweden.

6 Elofsson, K. Cost efficient reductions of stochastic nutrient loads to the Baltic Sea.

2001

1 Byström, O., Andersson, H. & Gren, I-M. Wetlands for cost effective abatement of stochastic pollutants.

2 Eriksson, C. Can green consumerism replace environmental regulation?

3 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Liljenstolpe, C. Valuing wetland attributes : an application of choice experiments.

4 Johnson, D., Nilsson, T. & Andersson, H. Price pooling and the gains from hedging : application to a Swedish grain co-operative.

5 Huang Zuhui & Bolin, O. Is there a future for farmer co-operatives in China?

6 Hart, R. Schumpeterian growth and sustainability : creative destruction of the environment?

7 Gren, I-M. Permit market for stochastic water pollution under non-compliance and market power.

8 Bergkvist, L., Lunneryd, D. & Öhlmér, B. Value based design of information for strategic decision making: the case of milk farms' converting to organic production.

9 Brady, M. Baltic Sea Nitrogen : Agricultural Abatement and Ecosystem Adaptation Models.

2002

1 Hart, R. Dynamic pollution control: time lags and optimal restoration of marine ecosystems.

2 Hedberg, A. Co-operative objectives and pricing policies in the input market.

3 Ekman, S. Cost-effective nitrogen leaching reduction as influenced by linkages between farm-level decisions.

4 Gren, I-M. & Li, C-Z. Environmental regulation enforcement and asymmetric information : a study of Sweden.

5 Eriksson, C. & Zehaie, F. Public and private bads in a growth model with increasing population.

6 Nilsson, F. Agricultural landscape management and biodiversity issues: how policy approaches are related to the character of the problem.

7 Brady, M. The relative cost-efficiency of arable nitrogen management in Sweden.

2003

1 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Lagerkvist, C.J. Farm animal welfare : testing for market failure.

2 Hultén, H. & Öhlmér, B. Why do some farmers develop and other quit their milk production?

3 Liljenstolpe, C. Valuing animal welfare: measuring consumer response with choice experiments.

2004

1 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Lagerkvist, C.J. Consumer benefits of labels and bans on genetically modified food: an empirical analysis using choice experiments.

2 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Lagerkvist, C.J. Using cheap-talk as a test of validity in choice experiments.

3 Lagerkvist, C.J. Agricultural policy uncertainty and anticipatory farm level adjustments: the case of direct payments and incentives for farmland investment.

4 Gren, I-M. Carbon sinks and costs of EU permit markets for carbon emissions.

5 Hoffmann, R. Ownership structure and endogenous quality choice in a duopoly framework.

6 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Lagerkvist, C.J. Consumer willingness to pay for farm animal welfare : transportation of farm animals to slaughter versus the use of mobile abattoirs.

7 Carlsson, F., Frykblom, P. & Lagerkvist, C.J. Preferences With and Without Prices : does the price attribute affect behavior in stated preference surveys?

8 Hennlock, M. Response aversion in games involving private provision of public goods.

2005

1 Zehaie, F. The Strategic Role of Self-Defence.

2 Zehaie, F. Environmental Policy in Open Economies.

3 Nilsson, F. Estimating the production costs of biological diversity on Swedish pastures.

4 Gren I-M., Pettersson, K., Blenckner, T. Climatic change and cost effective water management of the Swedish lake Mälaren.

2006

1 Hoffman, R., Andersson, H. Pricing Strategies with Consumer Uncertainty when Quality is Costly

2 Johansson, H. Mathematical and econometric approaches to technical efficiency estimation - how sensitive are the efficiency scores to methodology choices and functional forms?

3 Johansson, H. The input and output economic efficiency aspects of profit maximization: the case of Swedish dairy farms.

2007

1 Nilsson, F. O. L., Lindberg, E., Surry, Y. A trade performance analysis of fresh fruit and vegetables in Mediterranean countries.

## The Department of Economics

The department has about 80 persons employed of whom 26 have senior research and education positions and 28 have junior positions. Our activities lie within economics, business administration and history of agriculture. There are currently 6 full professorships in the following areas: Agricultural policy and international trade, Natural resource and environmental economics, Small business management (mainly farm firms), Entrepreneurship and small business development, Business administration, especially marketing and producer co-operatives, and History of agriculture.

The department provides two full undergraduate education curriculums up to the Master of Science level, Agronomy and MSc in either economics or business administration, with possibilities to specialize in agricultural economics, history of agriculture, natural resource and environmental economics, and small business development. In addition, we give a number of specialized courses for natural science students. There are about 400 students enrolled in our programs.

The graduate education scheme has a total of 30 active graduate students specializing in the above-mentioned subjects.

As part of an agricultural sciences university, there are ample possibilities for cross-disciplinary approaches. Being situated in Uppsala, there are rich opportunities for collaboration with departments at Uppsala University and in the Stockholm region. Today we are in the process of further developing this collaboration, mainly between the Economics department and the department of Business administration.

Pris: 40:- (exkl moms)

Tryck: SLU, Institutionen för ekonomi, Uppsala 2007.

*Distribution:*

Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet
Institutionen för ekonomi
Box 7013
750 07 Uppsala

Tel +46 18 - 67 18 00

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Economics
Box 7013
SE-750 07 Uppsala, Sweden

Fax + 46 18 - 67 35 02